



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,593	11/19/2003	Sealtiel Avalos	22768.21	8685
27683	7590	10/16/2007	EXAMINER	
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 Main Street Suite 3100 Dallas, TX 75202				KURR, JASON RICHARD
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2615				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/16/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/717,593	AVALOS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jason R. Kurr	2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 11-14 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards (US 4,907,082) in view of Gibson (US 4,747,140).

With respect to claim 1, Richards discloses a decoding system for demodulating a modulated analog signal containing a L+R signal, a L-R signal centered around a carrier signal, and a pilot signal (col.2 ln.33-65), the system comprising: first (fig.1 #29), second (fig.1 #27), and third (fig.1 #30) filters adapted to receive the signal and to separate the L+R signal, the pilot signal, and the L-R signal, respectively, from the signal (col.3 ln.17-29); clock reconstitution circuitry adapted to receive the pilot signal from the second digital filter and to reconstitute a clock signal from the pilot signal (fig.1 #31,35); L-R signal recovery circuitry (fig.1 #30,39) adapted to recover the L-R signal using the reconstituted clock signal (col.3 ln.23-29); and channel recovery circuitry (fig.1 #41) adapted to recover a left channel signal and a right channel signal from the L+R signal and the L-R signal (col.3 ln.43-49).

Richards does not disclose expressly wherein the decoding system **digitally demodulates** the modulated analog signal wherein an analog to digital converter is adapted to convert the analog signal into a digital signal and the first, second and third filters are digital.

Gibson discloses a decoding system that digitally demodulates a modulated MTS signal (fig.2, col.2 ln.9-23) wherein an analog to digital converter (fig.2 #12) is adapted to convert the analog signal into a digital signal and the first, second and third filters (fig.2 #14,16,18) are digital.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a digital demodulating setup in the system of Richards as implemented by Gibson.

The motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the number of parts needed to implement the circuit of Richards, because many of the circuit elements depicted in figure 1 of Richards may be implemented on a digital signal processor.

With respect to claim 2, Richards discloses the digital decoding system of claim 1 wherein the first digital filter is a low pass filter (fig.1 #29), however does not disclose expressly wherein the second digital filter is a bandpass filter, and the third digital filter is a high pass filter.

Official Notice is taken that it is well known in the art to filter signals to a desired frequency range. The transmission/carrier frequencies set for MTS signals by the BTSC are also well known in the art as evidenced by figures 1 and 1a of Gibson and Richards. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of

Art Unit: 2615

ordinary skill in the art to use appropriate filters, such as a BPF for the pilot signal and a HPF for the L-R signal, to separate the desired signals from the input composite signal. The motivation for filtering the signals to the frequency range set by the BTSC would have been to exclude any high frequency noises that are common to signal transmission.

With respect to claim 3, Richards discloses the digital decoding system of claim 2 wherein the low pass filter has a cut-off frequency of approximately 13.8 kHz, the band pass filter is centered at approximately 15.734 kHz, and the high pass filter is adapted to remove frequencies that pass through the low pass and band pass filters (col.2 ln.39-53).

With respect to claim 4, Richards discloses the digital decoding system of claim 2 further comprising additional signal recovery circuitry (fig.1 #35) including a demodulator adapted to receive input from the clock reconstitution circuitry and the high pass filter (col.3 ln.31-42), wherein the additional signal recovery circuitry is adapted to recover a signal (fig.1 "SAP") other than the L+R signal, L-R signal, and pilot signal from the modulated analog signal.

With respect to claim 5, Richards discloses the digital decoding system of claim 4 wherein the additional signal is a second audio program (SAP) signal (col.3 ln.31-42).

With respect to claim 6, Richards discloses the digital decoding system of claim 2 wherein the L-R signal recovery circuitry includes: a synchronous demodulator (fig.1 #30) adapted to demodulate the L-R signal received from the high pass filter using clock

information from the clock reconstitution circuitry (col.3 ln.17-29); and an expander (fig.1 #39) for expanding the demodulated L-R signal (col.3 ln.34-41).

With respect to claim 11, Richards discloses the digital decoding system of claim 1 wherein the channel recovery circuitry is adapted to calculate a sum and a difference of the L+R signal and the L-R signal (col.3 ln.42-56).

With respect to claim 12, Richards discloses the digital decoding system of claim 1 in view of Gibson, further comprising a digital to analog converter adapted to convert the recovered left channel and right channel signals from digital signals into analog signals (Gibson: fig.2 #36).

With respect to claim 13, Richards discloses a demodulator for demodulating a received analog signal including having a pilot signal, a L+R signal, and a L-R signal (col.2 ln.33-65), the demodulator comprising: a plurality of filters (fig.1 #27,29,33) for receiving the signal and separating the pilot signal, L+R signal, and L-R signal of the received digital signal into a clock reconstitution path, a L+R signal path, and a L-R signal path (fig.1), respectively; circuitry within the clock reconstitution path for receiving the pilot signal from one of the filters and reconstituting a clock signal from the pilot signal (fig.1 #31); circuitry within at least one of the L+R and L-R signal paths for recovering at least one of the L+R or L-R signals using the reconstituted clock signal (fig.1 #30); and circuitry for recovering a Left signal and a Right signal from the L+R signal path and the L-R signal path (fig.1 #41).

Richards does not disclose expressly wherein the decoding system digitally demodulates the modulated analog signal wherein an analog to digital converter is adapted to convert the analog signal into a digital signal.

Gibson discloses a decoding system that digitally demodulates a modulated MTS signal (fig.2, col.2 ln.9-23) wherein an analog to digital converter (fig.2 #12) is adapted to convert the analog signal into a digital signal.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a digital demodulating setup in the system of Richards as implemented by Gibson.

The motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the number of parts needed to implement the circuit of Richards, because many of the circuit elements depicted in figure 1 of Richards may be implemented on a digital signal processor.

With respect to claim 14, Richards discloses the demodulator of claim 13 wherein the circuitry for recovering the Left and Right signals includes a demultiplexing matrix (fig.1 #41).

With respect to claim 18, Richards discloses a method for decoding an encoded signal, the method comprising: receiving an encoded signal from a single analog channel (fig.1 #1), wherein the encoded signal includes at least first and second audio signals and a pilot signal (col.2 ln.33-65); separating the converted signal using multiple filters (fig.1 #27,29,33) each adapted to receive the signal into first and second signal paths for the first and second audio signals, respectively, and a clock reconstitution path for the pilot signal; and recovering the first and second audio signals using the first and

Art Unit: 2615

second signal paths, respectively, wherein at least one of the first and second audio signals is recovered based on information from the clock reconstitution path (fig.1 #31,35, col.3 ln.17-29).

Richards does not disclose expressly wherein the decoding method **digitally** decodes the encoded analog signal wherein an analog to digital converter is adapted to convert the analog signal into a digital signal and the multiple filters are digital.

Gibson discloses a decoding system that digitally demodulates a modulated MTS signal (fig.2, col.2 ln.9-23) wherein an analog to digital converter (fig.2 #12) is adapted to convert the analog signal into a digital signal and the multiple filters (fig.2 #14,16,18) are digital.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a digital demodulating setup in the system of Richards as implemented by Gibson.

The motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the number of parts needed to implement the circuit of Richards, because many of the circuit elements depicted in figure 1 of Richards may be implemented on a digital signal processor.

With respect to claim 19, Richards discloses the method of claim 18 in view of Gibson, further comprising performing a digital to analog conversion on the two recovered audio signals (Gibson: fig.2 #36).

With respect to claim 20, Richards discloses the method of claim 18 wherein recovering at least one of the first and second audio signals includes reconstituting clock information carried within the received signal (col.3 ln.17-29).

Claims 7-8, 10 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards (US 4,907,082) in view of Gibson (US 4,747,140) and in further view of Scarpa et al (US 5,673,293).

With respect to claim 7, Richards discloses the digital decoding system of claim 1 wherein the clock reconstitution circuitry comprises a phase-locked loop (PLL) (fig.1 #31, col.3 ln.17-29), however does not disclose expressly wherein the PLL is associated with at least one lookup table.

Scarpa discloses a digital decoding system for demodulating analog signals wherein a PLL is associated with a lookup table (col.9 ln.53-67, col.10 ln.1-5).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the lookup table of Scarpa to generate a sin/cos signal for use by the L-R demodulator of Richards.

The motivation for doing so would have been to precisely recreate the L-R signal through the use of a predefined table of signal parameters.

With respect to claim 8, Richards discloses the digital decoding system of claim 7 in view of Scarpa, wherein an output of the PLL represents a phase of the pilot signal, and wherein the output is used to address the lookup table to generate a sine wave for the L-R signal recovery circuitry (Scarpa: col.9 ln.53-67, col.10 ln.1-5).

With respect to claim 10, Richards discloses the digital decoding system of claim 7 wherein the PLL includes a sample rate of approximately 24 MHz. It is implied that the

Art Unit: 2615

PLL of Richards samples data at a sufficient rate, such as 24 MHz, in order to update the generation of the sin/cos signal for the purpose of accurately demodulating the L-R signal.

With respect to claim 15, Richards discloses the demodulator of claim 13 wherein the circuitry within the clock reconstitution path includes a phase-locked loop (PLL) (fig.1 #31), however does not disclose expressly wherein the PLL is associated with at least a first lookup table, or wherein the PLL is adapted to generate a digital value that is compared to a plurality of digital values in the first lookup table for use in at least one of the L+R and L-R signal paths.

Scarpa discloses a digital decoding system for demodulating analog signals wherein a PLL is associated with a lookup table (col.9 ln.53-67, col.10 ln.1-5).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the lookup table of Scarpa to generate a sin/cos signal for use by the L-R demodulator of Richards.

The motivation for doing so would have been to precisely recreate the L-R signal through the use of a predefined table of signal parameters.

With respect to claim 16, Richards discloses the demodulator of claim 15 further comprising additional signal recovery circuitry (fig.1 #35) adapted to recover a signal other than the L+R signal, L-R signal, and pilot signal (fig.1 "SAP").

With respect to claim 17, Richards discloses the demodulator of claim 16 in view of Scarpa, wherein the circuitry within the clock reconstitution path includes a second lookup table for use with the additional signal recovery circuitry.

Art Unit: 2615

Scarpa discloses a digital decoding system for demodulating analog signals wherein a PLL is associated with a lookup table (col.9 ln.53-67, col.10 ln.1-5).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a second lookup table to generate a sin/cos signal for use by the L-R demodulator of Richards when a user selects the secondary audio program signal (SAP).

The motivation for doing so would have been to precisely recreate the SAP signal through the use of a predefined table of signal parameters.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards (US 4,907,082) in view of Gibson (US 4,747,140) in view of Scarpa et al (US 5,673,293) and in further view of Elliott et al (US 6,826,247 B1).

With respect to claim 9, Richards discloses the digital decoding system of claim 7, however does not disclose expressly wherein the PLL comprises a digital phase accumulator and a second order accumulator.

Elliott discloses a PLL comprising a digital phase accumulator (fig.2 #208) and a second order accumulator (col.13 ln.31-44).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the digital PLL of Elliott in the system of Richards.

The motivation for doing so would have been to reduce input jitter noise by driving the phase error to zero through the use of Elliott's second order PLL system.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 1, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Gibson reference has solely been relied upon to show that it is well known in the art that digital demodulating systems exist and that it would have been obvious that the invention Richards could have been implemented as a digital system.

With regard to claim 1, the Applicant argues that element #30 of Richards is not actually a filter, but a demodulator. The Examiner would like to note that the term "filter" as claimed is a broad term that may encapsulate many circuit elements. The plain meaning of a filter is an electronic circuit, which performs signal-processing functions, specifically intended to remove unwanted signal components and/or enhance wanted ones. Demodulators are well known to separate or remove desired signals such as (L-R and L+R) signals from modulated signals through filtering techniques. Such a

process of demodulating a signal falls well within the realm of the definition of "filtering", hence the demodulator #30 may be considered to be a filter.

The Applicant continues that only the third filter of Richards is "adapted to receive the digital signal". The Examiner disagrees with this assertion. The term "adapted" does not imply that the filters receive the digital signal directly from the A/D conversion unit. In response, to the Applicant's remark "there is not a one-to-one correspondence of filters to signals (L+R, pilot, and L-R) as required by claim 1, the Examiner would like to note that claim 1 does not limit a one-to-one correspondence of filters to signals, it merely states "first, second, and third digital filters adapted to receive the digital signal and to separate the L+R signal, the pilot signal, and the L-R signal, respectively, from the digital signal".

Applicant's argument with respect to claim 1, concerning the clock restitution circuitry being adapted to receive a pilot signal from the element #30 has been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection of claim 1.

In response to applicant's argument on page 8 that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

The Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's reasons for combination of Richards with Gibson, stating that a combination would actually increase the number of circuit elements. The Examiner would like to note that digital systems are well known to incorporate multiple digital filters within a single digital signal processor, therefor the filters of Richards could actually be implemented into a single device, reducing the total number of circuit elements.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason R. Kurr whose telephone number is (571) 272-0552. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00am to 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on (571) 273-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JK
JK


VIVIAN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2090